

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated April 10, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 5, and 16 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 8 and 13-15 are hereby canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, claims 1-7, 9-12, and 16-20 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a).** *Office Action* at p.2, ¶ 1. While not necessarily agreeing with the Office, but in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant has canceled claim 8. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is moot. Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

**Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.** *Office Action* at p.3, ¶ 3. Applicant has amended claim 5 to clarify the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 5.

**Claims 1-4, 6, 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,453,586 to Stottmann (hereinafter “Stottmann”).** *Office Action* at p.3, ¶ 4. The rejection of claims 13 and 14 is moot as these claims are canceled herein. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the remaining claims and requests reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a front display unit slidably coupled to at least one of the control panel and the front panel and including a display portion for displaying operational status of the dishwasher; and a sliding latch and a latch mounting slot for slidably coupling the front display unit, wherein the front display unit is disposed between the control panel and the front panel.” *Stottmann* does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claims.

The Office associates the control panel of the present invention with the “recesses or openings 31” of *Stottmann*. See *Office Action* at p. 3, ¶ 5. Additionally, the Office associates the front display unit of the present invention with “the escutcheon 14” of *Stottmann*. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As illustrated Fig. 2 and the associated text of *Stottmann*, the recesses 31 are a part of the switch frame 26. Therefore, the recesses 31 do not correspond to the control panel of the present invention. Furthermore, *Stottmann* discloses that the escutcheon 14 only includes the slot 22 and the openings 23 for the passage of light from the switch assembly 25. See *Stottmann* at col. 2:33-39. The escutcheon 14 of *Stottmann* does not include a displaying portion as recited in the claims. In contrast, Applicant claims a “front display unit ... includes a display portion for displaying operational status of the dishwasher.” Thus, the escutcheon of the *Stottmann* does not corresponded to the front display unit. Thus, *Stottmann* does not teach all of the features as recited in independent claim 1.

*Stottmann* discloses that “push buttons of a ... switch assembly extend through the slot 22 and openings 23 permit the passage of light from the indicator lamps to show which individual push buttons are actuated.” *Stottmann* at col. 2:41-44. Thus, the indicator lamps show the operational state of the dishwasher. *Stottmann* is entirely silent with regards to a location of the indicator lamps. Considering that *Stottmann* discloses that “[s]mall openings 30 in the top of the switch frame 26 align with the openings 23 in plate 18 for passage of light from indicator lamps,” the indicator lamps could possibly be mounted on a rear side of the switch assembly. *Stottmann* at col. 3:2-4. Even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to consider *Stottmann*’s switch assembly 25 as the claimed “front display unit,” which it is not, *Stottmann* fails to disclose, expressly or inherently, that the switch assembly is disposed between the control panel and the front panel.

Independent claim 16 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 16 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “preparing a control panel, a front panel, and a front display unit; forming a sliding latch and a latch mounting slot for sliding the front display unit; disposing the front display unit between the control panel and the front panel; and coupling the front display unit to at least one of the control panel and the front panel by sliding the sliding latch in the latch mounting receptacle.” *Stottmann* does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

For the same or similar reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Stottmann* does not teach or suggest at least the above feature of claim 16, and respectfully submits that independent claim 16 is patentable over *Stottmann*.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of independent claims 1 and 16. Claim 2-4, 6 and 12 depend from independent claim 1. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

**Claims 7-8 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stottmann* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0201337 to Wuestefeld hereinafter (“*Wuestefeld*”).** *Office Action* at p.4, ¶ 10. The rejection of claim 8 is moot as this claim is canceled herein. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the remaining claims and requests reconsideration.

As stated above, *Stottmann* does not disclose all of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 16, from which claims 7 and 17-18 depend. *Wuestefeld* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Stottmann*. Indeed, *Wuestefeld* was cited only for a purported teaching of a “sliding latch ... with a slot for that latch.” *Office Action* at p. 4, ¶ 11. Thus, claims 7 and 17-18 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 17-18.

**Claims 9-11, 15 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stottmann* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,045,205 to Dingler (hereinafter “*Dingler*”).** *Office Action* at p.5. The rejection of claim 15 is moot as this claim is canceled herein. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the remaining claims and requests reconsideration.

As stated above, *Stottmann* doesn’t teach of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 16, from which claims 9-11 and 19-20 depend. *Dingler* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Stottmann*. Indeed, *Dingler* was cited only for a purported teaching of “a positioning tab and an aperture for the tab.” *Office Action* at p. 5, ¶ 13. Thus, claims 9-11 and 19-20 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 9-11 and 19-20.

### **CONCLUSION**

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objection and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: July 10, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

**Michael I. Angert**

Registration No.: 46,522

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant